

REMARKS

This is a preliminary amendment for U.S. Patent Application No. 10/626,481, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/029,453 entitled: "Search Light With Improved Optical Density" having a filing date of December 20, 2001.

In the parent case (U.S. Application No. 10/029,453) an Office Action issued on December 4, 2002. In this Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 969,785 to Kellner. This rejection is traversed.

As presented, Independent Claim 1 is directed to a light device for use in projecting a light beam having improved optical density. The light device includes a light source, concave reflector and a lens projection system that are substantially aligned relative to an optical axis. Disposed between the light source and the reflector is a collecting lens. The collecting lens, the aligned light source, reflector and lens projection system, allow the device to project a light beam that is collimated into a substantially parallel light beam. More importantly, the use of the collecting lens allows the substantially parallel light beam to be compressed such that it has a diameter of less than that of the reflector. In this regard, the resulting light beam has an increased optical density allowing the light beam to, for example, be projected over enhanced distances.

Kellner provides a projecting lamp having a lens and reflector wherein spherical aberrations of the lens and/or reflector are accounted for in order to produce a light beam that is parallel to the optical axis of the lamp. See lines 20-35. However, Kellner does not disclose a light device having the arrangement of Claim 1 including, for example, the use of a collecting lens that along with the reflector, light source and lens projection system is operative to produce a light beam having a diameter less than the diameter of the reflector. That is, Kellner fails to disclose a light device that produces a light beam that is compressed relative to the diameter of its reflector in order to increase the optical density of the resulting light beam. As shown in each illustration of Kellner, the resulting light beam has a diameter in excess of that of the reflector. See Figs. 1-6. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable as presented.

In the December 4, 2002 office action, the Examiner also indicated that dependent claims 8, 9, 11-14 and 17 were rejected as depending from a rejected base claim (Independent Claim 1), but would be allowable if written in independent form to include all limitations of the rejected base

claim and any intervening claim. Furthermore, the Examiner indicated dependent claims 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and rewritten to include all limitations of the rejected base (Independent Claim 1).

As presented herein, dependent claims 7-9, and 11 have each been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the limitations set forth in Independent Claim 1. In particular, new claim 24 corresponds to rewritten claim 11; new claim 30 corresponds to rewritten claim 8; new claim 34 corresponds to rewritten claim 9; and new claim 38 corresponds to rewritten claim 7, which has been amended to overcome a typographical error resulting in the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. It is believed that these claims are still in condition for allowance.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Russell T. Manning

Registration No. 51,260

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(303) 338-0997

Date: September 29, 2004